

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/004,157	10/31/2001	Beth T. Logan	200301980-2	8521
75	90 . 07/27/2005		EXAM	INER
IP ADMINISTRATION, LEGAL DEPARTMENT, M/S 35,			MAHMOUDI, HASSAN	
P. O. BOX 2720	ACKARD COMPANY, 00,		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
FORT COLLIN	S,, CO 80527-2400		2165	

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	<u> </u>	-	TW				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	:				
Advisory Action	10/004,157	LOGAN ET AL.	:				
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Tony Mahmoudi	2165					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence addres	ss				
THE REPLY FILED 07 July 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
I. ☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of							
this application, applicant must timely file one of the follo places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in complete following time periods:	owing replies: (1) an amendment, a otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	ffidavit, or other evidence compliance with 37 CFF	ce, which R 41.31; or				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of	•						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advievent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the			later. In no				
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b).	ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FI		OWT NIHTIV				
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f) Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on	,) and the appropriate extensi	ion fee have				
peen filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened states above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension for final Office action; or (2) as	ee under 37 set forth in (b)				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compositing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any ending a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be seen filed.	xtension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the	he appeal.				
AMENDMENTS	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,						
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brie	f, will <u>not</u> be entered bed	cause				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co	nsideration and/or search (see NO						
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	· ·	100 d 100 d 100 d 10					
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially re	educing or simplifying th	e issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally re	jected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
4. \square The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		ompliant Amendment (P	TOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s			:				
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) wo'uld be a the non-allowable claim(s). 	llowable if submitted in a separate	, timely filed amendmen	t canceling				
 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro 		rill be entered and an exp	planation of				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			:				
Claim(s) allowed:			:				
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:	•						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			•				
3. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fails	to provide a				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	•						
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	it does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowance	e because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)	:				
13. Other:							
•			:				
,	•		İ				

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The applicant's arguments presented in the After Final response, filed on 07-July-2005 have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive and the claim limitations of the "Finally Rejected" claims are still met by the previously cited references.

In response to the applicant's arguments that "to establish a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), (1) there must be some suggestion and motivation to combine reference teachings", the arguments have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive because the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the examiner is establishing motivation in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Yourlo by the teaching of Sanderson, and relying on Hoory et al for the motivation of combining Yourlo as modified, to includes Hamming window on each frame and to include reapplying a pre-emphasis on each frame.

In response to the applicant's arguments that the references either alone or in combination do not teach or suggest the referenced limitations of various claims, the arguments have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive, because:
"forming a spectral signature based on spectral features from the corresponding audio file" is taught by Yourlo (column 5, lines 64-67);
"forming a rhythmic beat representation from the corresponding audio file" is also taught by Yourlo (column 1, lines 43-47 and column 5, lines 37-42); "summing, including respective weighting results" is taught by Yourlo (column 11, lines 10-26).

JEFFREY GATHAI

SUPTRUISORY NATEN EXAMINER

ECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100